Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1-9, 11-12, 14, 16, 18-19, and 21-36.

Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-36

are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is

respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Objections - Specification

The specification was objected to because of several informalities. The Applicant

thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. The terms diplexer and

duplexer were called into question as having the same meaning -"two"- for the prefixes

di- and du-. The assumption is made that there is no distinction between the diplexer

filter and the duplexer filter. The Applicant respectfully submits that the term diplexer is

a term of art and is typically understood to mean the sending of two messages in the

same direction at the same time. On the other hand duplexer is understood to mean

allowing communication in opposite directions simultaneously.

Examiner Objections - Claims

Claims 6, 8, and 21-29 were objected to because of informalities. Again, the

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. The Applicant has

amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct the informalities.

The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-3, 7, 9, 12-13, 16-19, 32 and 34-35 were objected to as to being

dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if

rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims.

Claims 6, 8, 22-23, and 26-29 were noted as allowable if rewr4itten to overcome

the objection(s) and include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

Page 20 of 22

EUS/J/P/06-3172

claims. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to include

allowable subject matter of claims 2, 12, 22, and 32. Therefore no amendments have

been made to narrow the scope of the pending claims or to create any sort of estoppel.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the amended claims and submits

that claims 1-36 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ke, et al. (US Patent Number 6,658,263). In order to expedite allowance

of this application, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as suggested by

the Examiner to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention

The respective dependent claims contain the same allowable subject matter as

the amended independent claims and recite further limitations in combination with the

novel elements of the amended independent claims. The Applicant respectfully

requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 4, 5, 10, 14-15, 20, 24-25, 30, 33, 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Ke. In order to expedite allowance of this

application, the Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, as

suggested by the Examiner to include allowable subject matter found in respective

dependent claims 2, 12, 22 and 32.

The rejected dependent claims now contain the allowable subject matter of the

respective independent claims and the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of

the rejection of claims 4, 5, 10, 14-15, 20, 24-25, 30, 33, 36.

Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 13 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior

art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's

disclosure.

Page 21 of 22

Appl. No. 10/743555 Amdi. Dated July 5, 2006 Reply to Office action of April 5, 2006 Attorney Docket No. P18706-US1

EUS/J/P/06-3172

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted.

By Sidney L. Weatherford Registration No. 45,602

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656 sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com